| | Case 3:23-md-03084-CRB | Document 4135 | Filed 10/13/25 | Page 1 of 3 |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------|--|--|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | C. Brooks Cutter (SBN 121407 Jennifer S. Domer (SBN 30582 Celine Cutter (SBN 312622) CUTTER LAW P.C. 401 Watt Avenue Sacramento, CA 95864 Telephone: 916-290-9400 Facsimile: 916-588-9330 Email: bcutter@cutterlaw.com jdomer@cutterlaw.com ccutter@cutterlaw.com | 2) | | |
| 9 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | |
| 10 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | |
| 11 | | | | |
| 12 | IN RE: UBER TECHNOLO PASSENGER SEXUAL AS | | Case No.: 3:23-mo | |
| 13 | LITIGATION | | Hon. Charles R. Breyer ATTORNEY JENNIFER S. DOMER'S DECLARATION REGARDING | |
| 14 | This Document Relates to: | | | |
| 1516 | Jane Roe CL 73 v. Uber Tech Inc., et al., No 3:24-cv-7030- | | | OT IN COMPLIANCE S SEPTEMBER 16, 2025 |
| 17 18 | Jane Roe CL 94 v. Uber Tech al., No. 3:24-cv-09550-CRB | hnologies, Inc., et | Courtroom: 6 – 1 | 7 th Floor |
| 19 | Jane Roe CL 99 v. Uber Tech al., No. 3:25-cv-00855-CRB | hnologies, Inc., et | | |
| 2021 | Jane Roe CL 132 v. Uber Tee et al., No. 3:25-cv-02744-CR | | | |
| 22 | Jane Roe CL 143 v. Uber Tee et al., No. 3:25-cv-03260-CR | | | |
| 2324 | Jane Roe CL 153 v. Uber Tee et al., No. 3:25-cv-03818-CR | | | |
| 2526 | I, Jennifer S. Domer, declare as follows: | | | |
| 27 | 1. I am an attorney at Cutter Law P.C. admitted to practice before the courts of the | | | |
| 28 | State of California. I am a Partner at Cutter Law, P.C., and am one of the counsels of record for | | | |
| | -1- JENNIFER S. DOMER'S DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS | | | |

3

6

11

12

13

9

14 15

18 19

16

17

21 22

20

23 24

25

26 27

28

all filed Jane Roe CL claimants. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein, and if called to testify, I would testify competently as to the information below.

- 2. This declaration is made pursuant to the Court's Order to submit a Declaration within 28 days of the Order (October 13, 2025, being 28 days from September 16, 2025, the date the Order was signed) as to whether Counsel disagrees with any Plaintiff inclusion in Uber's Declaration, which Defendants submitted on October 6, 2025.
- 3. Counsel's firm has made extensive efforts to reach clients listed as Exhibit A, subject to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.
- 4. Counsel submitted a response to the Opposition Motion on September 5, 2025, and explained we would continue to make efforts to reach any missing claimants.
- 5. Those efforts include extensive phone calls, text messages, emails, physical mailings to last known address, and additional address searches in databases. Counsel has also employed a private investigator to help locate these individuals. Through the database searches and private investigators, Counsel also attempted to reach potential relatives in an effort to reach the Plaintiffs.
- 6. Through those continued efforts, Counsel received two deficiency cures after the date that Defendants submitted their Declaration.
- 7. Counsel submitted the Exhibit C Release for the PFS for Jane Roe CL 132 on October 9, 2025.
- 8. Counsel submitted the Verification for the PFS for Jane Roe CL 99 on October 13, 2025.
- 9. Though late, the submission of their deficiencies is still prior to the Court entering an Order for Dismissal.
- 10. Lastly, Jane Roe CL 94 was listed for not producing the Exhibit A Release. However, the PFS does not indicate a physical injury in Question 36 that would necessitate a Release for Exhibit A. Counsel emailed Defense Counsel October 13, 2025, and is awaiting a response.
 - 11. Counsel would therefore dispute their inclusion on Uber's current list of deficient

Filed 10/13/25 Page 3 of 3